SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

22nd Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXII, No. 4 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © March 1, 1992

From OMB's Science Chief

Super Collider in Trouble Without Foreign Money

Robert E. Grady, Associate Director for Natural Resources, Energy and Science at the Office of Management and Budget since the beginning of the Bush Administration, has been nominated for the No. 2 job at OMB. Grady spoke on February 19th at the monthly (or so) seminar sponsored by George Washington University's Center for International Science and Technology Policy. The session was attended by about 100 federal sci-tech officials and assorted onlookers. Following are segments from the question-and-answer period, transcribed and edited by SGR.

•

Q. Will the Super Collider be able to proceed without a substantial foreign contribution?

Grady. I doubt it, frankly. It has always been planned, in envisioning how the Super Collider would be financed and how its benefits would be shared, that there would be the partnership of the State of Texas and foreign partnerships. As a practical matter, there's no question but that a signal from

Science Attaches in Washington—P.5

"Porkbusters" Target Budget—P.6

Japan or another foreign partner would be tremendously helpful in the upcoming Congressional debate. Because we're now entering a period where we'll be on a sustained "ramp-up" as we move into construction, testing the magnets, etc. So I think, at the end of the day, that foreign partnership is critical and we're going to continue to pursue it.

Q. The National Science Foundation's facilities program [for construction of university laboratories] provides the only alternative to Congressional earmarking of funds [which has been strongly criticized by the Administration]. But for the second year, the Administration has not requested funds for the facilities program.

Grady. I don't think it's the only alternative, actually. In our judgment, the proper way to [provide for the] tremendous need of facilities at academic institutions is through the cost-recovery process [from overhead payments on research grants]. That is how, over time, you'll be able to sustain the investment needed to keep that infrastructure in place and to finance new infrastructure. The amount of cost recovery for buildings and the investment the federal government has

(Continued on Page 2)

Truly Mishandled

Ouster of Space Agency Head Draws Widespread Criticism

Since adroit wielding of the bureaucratic shiv is enshrined as a fundamental requirement of political leadership, Washington has responded with bipartisan dismay to the crudeness of Admiral Richard Truly's ouster from the helm of NASA.

A properly functioning White House would have put the Admiral overboard without a splash, persuading him of the national necessity to assume a pleasant ambassadorship or the chairmanship of a makework Presidential commission. But Truly resisted early suggestions that it was time to leave, and submitted his resignation only after George Bush

(Continued on Page 3)

In Brief

NIH's Office of Scientific Integrity was immobilized last month when Rep. John Dingell testily inquired whether OSI had shredded documents from its probe of Robert Gallo, disputed claimant to discovery of the AIDS virus. In a fax February 19 to NIH Director Bernadine Healy, Dingell cited "extremely disturbing" reports, and asked Healy to "secure the shredder bags for delivery" to his Committee if any shredding has occurred.

Whereupon, OSI came to a halt for two days while its chief, Jules Hallum, interviewed his 19 staffers and conferred with lawyers. Hallum says OSI routinely shreds excess materials, but denies obliterating anything important. Dingell staffers were still awaiting a reply last week. Whatever the essence of the episode, it reflects the nasty relationship between NIH and its House law-writing Committee.

Publication of the National Academy of Sciences report on scientific misconduct, in the works since early 1990 and originally scheduled for around the end of last year, has again been postponed, this time to April. Dissents by several members of the 22-member panel led to rewrites that are now going through the Academy's nit-picking review. Working title: *Responsible Science: Insuring the Integrity of the Research Process.*

Tips on dealing with the press are contained in Communicating Science News: A Guide for Scientists, Physicians, and Public Information Officers, *by the National Association of Science Writers. In addition to advising clarity and candor, the* Guide *says that at scientific meetings, "Journalists welcome coffee, tea, soft drinks, and snacks in the newsroom." Copies, $3 each, are available from: NASW, PO Box 294, Greenlawn, NY 11740; tel. 516-757-5664.*

. . . Yachts and Flowers Forced Indirect-Cost Revisions

(Continued from Page 1)

made in buildings through the cost-recovery process has increased substantially.... But the notion that a $25-million appropriation from NSF is going to address what is by definition a multi-billion-dollar problem is not that compelling.

[Rather than limited funds for facilities] we made the judgment that a much better use of federal dollars, and a much higher return on use of direct appropriations, would be for the purchase of sophisticated instrumentation, also a great need out there in academic institutions ... Both last year and this year, we proposed $50 million for academic instrumentation. In FY '92, Congress split that in half, provided $25 million for instrumentation and $25 million for facilities. We're back again this year, suggesting that there's room for an even greater investment on the instrumentation side. We don't believe that a direct appropriation through NSF is the solution to the building problem ...

Q. *Can you expect universities to count on the government to maintain a stable cost-recovery process? The debate that's going on now on indirect costs is, in a broader sense, a renegotiation of the compact between universities and government for the support of research.*

Grady. I think it's a renegotiation based on evidence which was too important to ignore. I think it's unfortunate that some of the abuses that were revealed had, in fact, occurred. But there was a consensus in the American public that it was inappropriate for universities to be recovering dollars from the federal government for the kinds of expenditures that were splashed in the headlines, whether it was the yachts or flowers or whatever else. We tried to be very careful in thinking about how we, at OMB, revised the A-21 Circular [governing recovery of indirect costs of government-supported research] in response to that. First thing we did was to agree, with all the relevant federal agencies, on a clear list of disallowables that, we think, any reasonable person would agree would be inappropriate—like yachts and flowers and country-club expenses. Second thing, we put the cap on the administrative expenses side of the indirect-cost recovery process.... I think most universities involved in what you call the compact realize that some reform is clearly called for in the wake of the revelations of the Dingell Subcommittee.... I don't think we'll compromise the integrity of that relationship between the federal government and universities because the relationship and partnership has allowed us such tremendous benefits over many decades to the country. I would note that at the time that OMB came out with this list of disallowables and the revised Circular A-21, there was a very real threat of legislative action that would have been far, far more dramatic, much more of the meat-ax approach that would have seriously damaged the ability of universities to recover legitimate costs.

Q. *The budget included respectable increases for the Super Collider and the Space Station. How determined is the Administration to push for full funding for both of them?*

Grady. There is no question that the Administration is very committed to Station, and it's very strongly supported.... With respect to Station, the consensus was formed last year in Congress after a very earnest, important, forthright, and thoughtful debate. That consensus will be maintained.... I believe the votes are there for Station. With respect to Super Collider, it's problematic that there's not yet on the horizon a firm commitment from an international partner. I would hasten to point out, however, that also with the Super Collider, when that has been tested in floor votes, there has been strong support in both houses.... I still think the votes are there, but the lack of a foreign partner makes the road a little rockier.

Q. *What does the end of the Cold War mean for the US government's role in R&D?*

Grady. We've had a very interesting set of discussions with the national labs, which have performed a tremendous amount of defense work, to talk about some of the exciting new missions. We talked about what are some of the ways we could help them make sure that the new missions that they identify are driven by interest in the commercial sector, that there's a demand-pull to help them identify what their priorities might be.

But thinking about the constraints to making radically increased investments in the future to make up any shortfall that comes from Defense phasing down, there's another constraint that's far more important. A much more important dynamic is the continued, unrestrained growth of the entitlement programs [Medicaid, Medicare, agricultural supports, etc.]. When you think about the future of the budget, and the future of the R&D enterprise, the thing that sits there like an 8 trillion pound gorilla is the fact that the entitlements have grown without annual review by Congress, without any careful rationale guiding them. They were 23 percent of the budget when JFK became President in 1961, 35 percent in 1970, over 50 percent today. They're on a path that outstrips inflation, outstrips growth of the beneficiary population, outstrips our ability to finance them.

We're now at the point where the mandatory side of the budget and interest is over $1 trillion [in a federal budget of about $1.5 trillion]. And the debate over the peace dividend is about shifting resources in the last third of that $1.5 trillion. All defense plus all domestic discretionary are $500 billion, which is less than these entitlement programs.

The step that can be taken to insure the future health of the federal R&D enterprise is radical, radical reform in our pattern of entitlements. If you could just hold entitlement growth to inflation plus growth in the beneficiary population, you would save over the course of 5 years $392 billion. In other words, over the next 5 years, entitlements are growing by almost $400 billion faster than the combination of inflation plus population growth. It is obvious that is not sustainable.

. . . Space Chairman Quayle Sought Change at NASA

(Continued from Page 1)

gave him the word. News of the ouster was leaking around when Truly himself acknowledged that he had been forced to resign, with April 1 the departure date.

Respected for his management of NASA in difficult circumstances, Truly has drawn sympathy on Capitol Hill and elsewhere. But the real victim is NASA, leaderless and demoralized just as it heads into heavy financial weather on Capitol Hill.

Widely regarded as the impresario in this episode of personnel mismanagement is Vice President Dan Quayle, still submerged in the polls despite three years of persistent coaching, cramming, and polishing by teams of specialists. Truly's steady, unadventurous style of running the space agency conflicted with Quayle's ambitions to appear assertive and innovative in his capacity as Chairman of the National Space Council, one of the few real jobs assigned to the Vice President.

After Truly's axing became public, Rep. Norman Mineta (D-Calif.), a member of the House space subcommittee, declared that NASA has been pressed into service as "a public relations tool for the rehabilitation of Dan Quayle." An editorial in *Aviation Week* questioned the "brutal haste" of the firing, adding that the "timing and suddenness of Truly's removal smack more of a coup than a rational redirection of the space program."

Appointed at the outset of the Bush Administration, Truly took over the agency while it was still convalescing from the *Challenger* calamity and got it functioning again. His presence surely could have been tolerated over the 9 remaining months to election day, especially since the number two job at NASA has been vacant since last November. Suitable candidates for senior posts are ordinarily difficult to land so late in a Presidential term. But in these embarrassing circumstances, the White House is reported to be pushing hard to fill the vacancies quickly.

Quayle apparently was eager to move. The Admiral, the first astronaut to head NASA, was part of the old clique that got NASA into trouble in the first place. And though space operations have proceeded relatively smoothly under his regime, the agency remains inbred, provincial, and bound for trouble. Quayle should not be mistaken for a managerial giant or a celestial visionary for sensing the need for change.

The great failing of NASA has been its enchantment with majestic ventures predicated on faith that Congress will always provide, even after fancifully low price estimates are followed by crushing bills. The prime example is the Space Shuttle, which will be the centerpiece of NASA operations for years to come, because its ravenous financial needs consumed support for virtually all other launch systems. The Shuttle provides a classic parable of high-technology and government.

When the Shuttle was on the drawing boards in the 1970s, NASA assured Congress that the fleet would fly as many as 60 missions a year, thus providing a voluminous cargo capacity that would dramatically reduce the costs of going into space. But, as a recent report by the General Accounting Office dryly points out, "Realism forced several downward revisions in annual flight predictions." [*Space Shuttle: NASA Faces Challenges in Its Attempt to Achieve Planned Flight Rates* (GAO/NSIAD-9232; 48 pp.), available without charge from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20877; tel. 202/275-6241.]

The first flight, in 1981, demonstrated that the shuttle was a temperamental, fragile, and cumbersome craft. In 1985, NASA reduced the projected flight schedule to 24 per year, by 1990. In 1986, following the *Challenger* accident, the schedule dropped to 16 flights per year, by 1991. But the actual number of flights in 1991 numbered only 8, which is probably the most that NASA can muster, the GAO says.

The drop in flights, from the fanciful 60 down to an actual 8, has had calamitous financial effects. With the development and overhead costs of the Shuttle spread over 60 flights per year, each flight would cost about $50 million, according to the GAO. But scale the flight schedule down to a mere 8 per year and the cost per flight works out to $358 million. The GAO credits the Shuttle with "consuming over one-

(Continued on Page 4)

OSTP in Dark on Firing?

Boosters of the role of Presidential science advice proclaim the importance of close consultation between the White House Science Adviser and the President in filling top technical jobs. Was D. Allan Bromley, head of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in on the Truly ouster? Evidence suggests not. On February 6, Bromley told the President's Council of Advisers for Science and Technology that Truly would be the next Chairman of the Committee on Education and Human Resources, part of the Federal Coordinating Council for Science and Technology. Chairmanships on the Council go to lofty office holders. DOE Secretary Watkins now holds the Education post. Four days later, the NASA chief was, in effect, fired.

© 1992, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg
Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif
Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $358.00 (two years, $610.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . Truly Warns Programs Are Outpacing Budget

(Continued from Page 3)

fourth of the [space] agency's proposed fiscal 1992 budget."

Truly inherited the Shuttle mess and tried to make the best of it, but in the process he was intransigent about shaking NASA loose from its extravagant traditions and overly cautious about developing alternative strategies of using space. When yet another blue-ribbon commission—this one chaired by Norman Augustine, head of Martin Marietta—advised NASA to focus on science, minimize reliance on the Shuttle, and develop a new family of expendable launchers—NASA nodded and continued on its way. The Space Station, conceived with the same fiscal irresponsibility as the Shuttle, was finally reined in when Congress, normally keen for big spending in space, rebelled at the runaway cost estimates and set strict limits on total spending and annual increases.

Quayle picked up on the theme that NASA has developed a tight little culture that's resistant to outsiders, no matter how bright and innovative their ideas may be. The Council has pushed NASA to give serious attention to unconventional approaches to getting into space and working there—such as inflatable space craft that would reduce launch weight while still providing the needed volume in space. According to the February 17 *Aviation Week*, which has the best lines into NASA, Quayle has fallen under the space spell of Lowell Wood, a senior manager at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and a major promoter of the Strategic Defense Initiative during the Reagan Administration. Wood, the magazine reports, has worked up a plan for streamlining NASA's management and operating procedures to move faster and cheaper on major programs, including a manned Mars flight.

There's no shortage of discontent with NASA's plodding and costly style. The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has criticized NASA for neglecting the development of robots and automated space instruments that could perform research without the costly presence of humans in space [*Exploring the Moon and Mars: Choices for the Nation* (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01250-2; 104 pp.; $5), available from: USGPO, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402-9325; tel. 202/783-3238].

But NASA, still dominated by the romance of humans in space, has adopted a wily tactic in the controversy over man vs. instruments in space. Neglecting research in this area, it contends that machines are still too unsophisticated to do the job. In one of his final Congressional appearances as chief of NASA, Truly told the House Space Subcommittee what it already knew—that the proposed NASA budget, $15 billion, can't sustain all the programs on the current menu. He declined to discuss his ouster.

A warm Presidential ceremony was the Admiral's due for his service to NASA. It's time to break up the old-boy network at the space agency. But it could have been done nicely.—DSG

Zero Gravity at the White House

Snippets from dialog between White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater and reporters, February 14, the day after Admiral Truly's resignation as head of NASA.

•

Fitzwater. As you all know, he is a friend of the President's, and we think he's done an outstanding job of bringing that agency back to life following the *Challenger* incident.... Whether there are policy differences or not, from our point of view, he deserves our gratitude and support, and we want to only herald the outstanding job that he has done

Q. What would those policy differences be?

Fitzwater. I don't know that there were any....

Q. Admiral Truly says flatly that his resignation was demanded. He was told to resign and wasn't given a reason. Do you have a reason for us?

Fitzwater. I suggest you ask him....

Q. I'm sorry, the reason I'm asking you is because Admiral Truly says that he was not given a reason.

Fitzwater. Well, he submitted his resignation, and we have responded with the praise that we think he deserves....

Q. Why was it that his resignation was requested?

Fitzwater. His resignation was submitted, and it was...

Q. But it was submitted, he says, after he was told to submit it.... He said he met with the President here Monday night and that his resignation was demanded.

Fitzwater. We've had meetings with the Admiral time and again in the last several months, and there have been any number of considerations of policy. But once again, we have only the highest regard for him....

Q. Is his version of events not true?

Fitzwater. I'm simply saying that from our point of view, he's done a great job, and we have the highest praise for him.

Q. Did the Administration request his resignation?

Fitzwater. The Admiral submitted his resignation and we accepted it.

Q. Are you denying that his resignation was forced?

Fitzwater. I'm saying that he submitted his resignation, that we accepted it, but we think he's done an outstanding job in many areas and we wish him nothing but the best....

Q. But did he submit it upon request?

Fitzwater. Again, those are questions that you have to ask him.

Q. He has already said that.

Fitzwater. Well, then, fine. You've got his answer. Now you've got mine.

Science Officials at Embassy Posts in Washington

The science and technology specialists assigned to embassy and multi-national staffs in Washington are a useful but little-known source of information about research-related matters in their home countries. Since SGR last published the roster, September 15, 1989, enough changes have occurred for another listing. (Their American counterparts in embassies abroad were listed in SGR October 15, 1991). Address by Embassy of the country named or other organizational name, plus address, as given below; the telephone area code is 202.

•

Argentina. Mr. Juan Skaf, Counselor, Science and Technology; 1600 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20009; 939-6400.

Australia. Mr. Norman Gomm, Counselor, Industry, Science and Technology; Dr. John Harries, Counselor, Nuclear; 1601 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20036; 797-3258.

Austria. Mr. Bernhard Zimburg, Counselor, Science and Technology; 3524 International Court, Wash., DC 20008; 895-6700.

Belgium. Mr. Denis Dewez, Scientific Counselor; Mr. Martin Hinoul, Attache, Technological; 3330 Garfield St. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 333-6900.

Brazil. Ms. Carmen Lidia Richter Ribeiro Moura, First Secretary; 3006 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 745-2750.

Bulgaria. Mr. Vladimir Ossenov, First Secretary, Science and Technology; 1621 22nd St. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 387-7970.

Canada. Mr. Michael Stephens, Counselor, Science and Technology; 501 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20001; 682-7793.

China, People's Republic. Mr. Pan Bao Zhen, Minister-Counselor, Science and Technology; Mr. Zhao Kang Yuan, Mr. Qian Yongming, First Secretaries; Mr. Lan Chongyuan, Mr. Chen Ho Ping, Ms. Li Hua, Second Secretaries; 2300 Connecticut Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 328-2530.

Czechoslovakia. Mrs. Jana Simonova, Second Secretary, Science and Technology; 3900 Linnean Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 363-6315.

Denmark. Ms. Grith Becker, Counselor, Commercial; Mr. Bent Skou, Minister-Counselor, Press and Cultural; 3200 Whitehaven St. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 234-4300.

Egypt. Dr. Kamel Abdelhamid Ahmed, Deputy Director, Cultural Bureau; 2310 Decatur Place NW, Wash., DC 20008; 232-5400.

European Communities, Delegation of the Commission. Mr. Gilbert Fayl, Counselor, Science and Technology; Mrs. Helen Donoghue, Second Secretary, Science and Technology; 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037; 862-9574.

European Space Agency. Mr. Ian Pryke, Head, Washington Office; 955 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Wash., DC 20024; 488-4158.

Finland. Dr. Markku Auer, Counselor, Scientific; Mr. Pekka Parnanen, Mr. Joseph Reini, Assistants for Science and Technology; 3201 New Mexico Ave. NW, Suite 270, Wash., DC 20016; 686-2080.

France. Dr. Claude Wolff, Counselor, Science and Technology; Dr. Francois Armanet, Mrs. Michele Durand (biotechnology and environment), Dr. Remy Lestienne (CNRS), Mr. Bruno Oudet (telecommunications), Scientific Attaches; Mr. Bernard Luciani, Attache (space); 4101 Reservoir Road NW, Wash., DC 20007; 944-6000.

Germany. Dr. Klaus E. Schroeter, Counselor, Science and Technology; Ms. Irene Ruede, Counselor, Science and Technology; Mr. Helmut Lueders (environment), Mr. Hans Peter Hofmann (energy, basic science, nuclear energy, non-proliferation), First Secretaries; 4645 Reservoir Rd. NW, Wash., DC 20007; 298-4000.

Great Britain. Mr. Alastair Allcock, Counselor, Science and Technology; Mr. Ronald Egginton, Mr. Roger Jennings, First Secretaries, Science and Technology; 3100 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 462-1340.

Greece. Mr. Petros Kontos, Head of Economic Office; 1731 21st St. NW, Wash., DC 20009; 745-7100.

Hungary. Mr. Istvan Mezei, First Secretary, Scientific; 3910 Shoemaker St. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 362-6730.

India. Mr. Amitav Mallik, Counselor, Defense Technology; Mr. J. Raja, Counselor, Space; 2107 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 939-7000.

Indonesia. Mr. Giri Kartono, Attache, Educational and Cultural; 2020 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20036; 775-5232.

Ireland. Mr. Tim O'Connor, First Secretary; 2234 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 462-3939.

Israel. Dr. Meir Yogev, Counselor, Scientific; 3514 International Dr. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 364-5500.

Italy. Dr. Emanuele Mannarino, Dr. Giorgio Matiello, Scientific Attaches; 1601 Fuller St. NW, Wash., DC 20009; 328-5500.

Japan. Mr. Yukihide Hayashi, Counselor, Scientific; Mr. Takao Kuramochi, First Secretary; Mr. Masato Hori, Assistant, Science and Technology; 2520 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 939-6920.

Korea. Mr. Hai Sool Chin, Attache, Science; 2600 Virginia Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 939-6479.

Luxembourg. Mrs. Arlette M. Conzemius-Paccoud, Counselor; 2200 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 265-4171.

Madagascar. Mr. Jocelyn Rafidinarivo, Counselor, Financial and Public Affairs; 2374 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 265-5525.

Mexico. Mr. Joaquin Gonzalez-Casanova, Minister for Cultural and Scientific Affairs; 1911 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20006; 728-1641.

Netherlands. Dr. Paul op den Brouw, Counselor, Science and Technology; Mr. Hans van Zijst, Counselor (environment); Mr. Frank de Mann, Attache (health); Dr. Frederik Van de Linde, Dr. Hieronimus L. Potma, Attaches, Science and Technology; 4200 Linnean Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20008; 244-5300.

New Zealand. Mr. David Cunliffe, Second Secretary, Political and Economic; 37 Observatory Circle NW, Wash., DC 20008; 328-4800.

Norway. Dr. Gunner Wilhelmsen, Counselor, Scientific; 2720 34th St. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 944-8981.

Pakistan. Dr. Sikandar Hayad, Counselor, Education; 2315 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 939-6200.

Poland. Mr. Hubert Romanovski, Counselor, Science; Mr. Pawel Gonera, Second Secretary, Science; 2640 16th St. NW, Wash., DC 20009; 234-3800.

Portugal. Mr. Carlos D. Souto, Counselor, Industrial and Scientific; 2125 Kalorama Rd. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 328-8610.

Russian Federation. Dr. Anatoly Shishkin, Science Counselor; Mr. Vladimir Kruyokov, Counselor, Science and Technology; 1125 16th St. NW, Wash., DC 20036; 628-7554.

(Continued on Page 6)

Congressional Coalition Aims to Block the Pork

Pork-barrel appropriations—many destined for academe—soared to a record $1.5 billion last year on Capitol Hill, according to Congressional critics of the stealthy funding technique. This year, a small but growing Congressional contingent, the "Porkbusters," has introduced legislation to throttle expenditures of the substantial volume of money remaining in the pipeline.

The odds for success are fairly dim, since the ability to get money for the folks back home is a potent contributor to Congressional longevity. The sheer volume of pork-barrel funds, also known as earmarked appropriations, testifies to the popularity and the ease of delivering the goods—usually by slipping an item into a money bill while colleagues wink or doze. But with the budget crunch pressing on big, popular programs in housing, health, education, and other areas, the cumulative effects of small pork-barrel operations are increasingly seen as burdensome and disruptive.

The Bush Administration has adopted the earmark issue as an excuse for not asking Congress for money for academic facilities, contending that the booming earmarks are providing a substantial, if unfocused, volume of support for construction.

After an inconspicuous and futile late start in the last Congress, the anti-earmark movement, designated Porkbuster II, took to the field on February 26 to announce introduction of the Spending Priorities Reform Act of 1992 (HR 4315; S. 2265). The aim, according to one of the leading sponsors, Rep. Harris Fawell (R-Ill.), is to rescind the unspent money—amount unspecified, but it's surely considerable, since federal appropriations often trickle out slowly.

Fawell, with co-sponsor Senator Hank Brown (R-Colorado), concedes that appropriations can fall into a wide range of political purity and that not all the items identified by him and his colleagues as earmarks may actually deserve that label. But, for starters, the coalition has put together a list of 642 suspect projects, with funds totaling $1,540,363,400, spread over eight Congressional appropriations subcommittees.

Among the academic recipients and amounts named in the bill are the following:

Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa., $1 million for a Center for Entrepreneurial Opportunity.

University of Central Arkansas Small Business Institute National Data Center, $150,000.

University of Kentucky Advanced Science and Technology Commercialization Center, $4.5 million.

Kansas State University, $7.7 million, for environmental research and development.

Northeast Texas Community College, Mt. Pleasant, Texas, Business and Industrial Development Center, $300,000.

Western Michigan University, for a research project to recycle mixed office waste, $1.3 million.

Salvaged from last year's Porkbuster legislation is a set of specific criteria for identifying them, sometimes difficult in the hurly-burly of the appropriations process. Presenting a seven-part test, Rep. Fawell suggests that failure on any three points constitutes evidence of pork-barreling. It's pork if the appropriation:

(1) was never the subject of an authorizing committee or subcommittee hearing; (2) lacks specific authorization for individual projects; (3) was added by the Committee in conference when neither bill going to conference originally contained such a provision; (4) has no meaningful relationship to the Act under which it is funded or the agency or program under which it is administered; (5) for the project was non-competitively awarded—this would also include projects which were not subject to peer review, which failed in the competitive process, or in which the competitive process was waived; (6) was earmarked in violation of established Congressional procedure or the process prescribed by law; (7) was for projects of purely local interest, without national or regional importance.

The anti-pork bill starts with 20 co-sponsors, 18 of them Republicans—in a Democrat Congress. But the session is young, and the issue does not lack growth potential. Senate and House leaders are not among the sponsors, but some of them are on record as strongly anti-pork.

Embassy Science Officials

(Continued from Page 5)

Saudi Arabia. Mr. Abdul Turjoman, Science Officer; 601 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20037; 298-8857.

South Africa. Mr. Niels C. Huaffe, Counselor, Science and Technology; Mr. Brian Russell, Counselor (minerals and energy); 3201 New Mexico Ave. NW, Suite 300, Wash., DC 20016; 362-8805.

Spain. Mr. Manuel de la Camara, Minister, Economic and Commercial; 2558 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 265-8600.

Sweden. Mr. Svante Lundin, Counselor, Science and Technology; Mr. Nils Johansson, Mrs. Eva Ahlner, Ms. Eva Hedblom, Ms. Anna-Karin Jarmyr, Mr. Stefan Tarstedt, Assistants to the Counselor; 600 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20037; 337-5168.

Switzerland. Dr. Christoph von Arb, Counselor, Science and Technology; Dr. Martin Buechi, Attache, Science and Technology; 2900 Cathedral Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 745-7955.

Thailand. Mr. Sirithan Pairoj-Boriboon, Counselor, Science and Technology; 4301 Connecticut Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 364-2800.

Tunisia. Dr. Hedi Sioud, Counselor, Director, University Mission; 1515 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20005; 265-0066.

Venezuela. Mr. Edmond Benedetti, Minister-Counselor, Petroleum; 1099 30th St. NW, Wash., DC 20007; 342-2214.

Yugoslavia. Mrs. Ljiljana Milojevic-Borovcanin, First Secretary, Science, Technology, and Economic; 2410 California St. NW, Wash., DC 20008; 462-6566.

More IN PRINT: "Genome News," Fusion, Aerospace

(Continued from Page 8)

the bureaucratic trenches are informative and frank, but unfortunately fall into the fallacy of equating exhausting schedules with useful work. Included are resumes of the current S&T office holders and names and dates of service of recent predecessors. The field of 60 is arbitrary, but covers a heavy slice of top posts. Most of the support for the book project, some $75,000, was provided by the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government, which is chronically exercised about assuring the quality of appointees to those S&T posts. "Prune" in the cryptic title is a takeoff from the so-called "plum" book, the bible of election-year patronage, a quadrennial government publication, with plum-colored cover, listing top federal jobs and their salaries. Author Trattner, Vice President of the Council and former journalist and career Foreign Service officer, says "prune" is more experienced than "plum." Coming next fall, a Prune book on federal financial management.

Order from: Madison Books, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, Md. 20706; tel. 1-800/462-6420; in Maryland: 301/459-3366; also available from book sellers.

Human Genome News (16 pp., no charge), bi-monthly newsletter, co-sponsored by the Department of Energy and NIH, reports on the rapidly expanding genome project, including publications, personnel changes, conference schedules and summaries, etc. Circulation is reported at about 8000, which suggests the existence of a hefty constituency for a relatively young field of research.

Order from: Human Genome Management Information System, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Attn. Betty Mansfield, PO Box 2008, Oak Ridge, Tenn. 37831-6050; tel. 615/574-7582.

Aerospace and the Environment (64 pp., no charge), from the newsletter of the Aerospace Industries Association, reprints of articles, July 1990-December 1991, on environmental activities of various firms, plus reports on federal regulatory programs, etc.

Order from: Aerospace Industries Association, Office of Communications, 1250 Eye St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/371-8553.

Research Activities (8 pp., no charge) monthly newsletter of the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, part of the US Public Health Service, reports on grants, publications, conferences, etc. related to the Agency's mandate to assess health-care technologies. Among the items in the January issue: report of a $5.6 million, 5-year grant to Duke University Medical Center for a study of stroke prevention in high-risk patients, and a summary of a study of Medicaid usage by AIDS patients.

Order from: AHCPR Publications Clearing House, PO Box 8547, Silver Spring, Md. 20907; tel. 1-800-358-9295.

From the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), part of the Library of Congress, the following are available without charge.

•

US Commercial Space Activities (92-125 SPR; 47 pp.), a glum assessment of profit-seeking in space, reported here to have generated revenues of $1.7 billion in 1990, while federal agencies, civilian and military, were spending $32 billion. Apart from satellite communications, the report says, self-supporting activities have not materialized. The report, by Tony Reichhardt, a CRS consultant, reviews attempts at commercialization, and lists current programs and relevant legislation.

Magnetic Fusion Energy (IB91039; 14 pp.), a periodic update of budgets and the latest priority shifts in the 40-year-long magnetic fusion program, currently budgeted at $337 million. The report is by Richard E. Rowberg, head of the Division.

Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems (IVHS): Challenges, Constraints, and Federal Programs (92-189 SPR; 99 pp.), a detailed review of IVHS—which boils down to applying smarts to speeding up traffic. The field is a rare comer in a generally soft R&D market, rising from $4.4 million in federal funding in 1990 to $246 million this year, according to the report, by Paul Rothberg, CRS Specialist in Science and Technology. With defense on the skids, lots more could be on the way, since a virtually unnoted bill, the IVHS Act of 1991, authorizes $659 million over six years for R&D.

Order from: Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Madison Building, Washington, DC 20540; attn. Ms. Raap; tel. 202/707-7014.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please Bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $358.00 ☐;
two years, $610.00 ☐
(Foreign airmail, $35.00 per year; foreign surface $15.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970;
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054

IN PRINT: "Science Indicators," Dingell Hearings

The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

Science and Engineering Indicators 1991 (487 pp., no charge), 10th biennial edition of the National Science Foundation's colossus of statistics on research and development and related matters, mainly devoted to the US, but with much international data, too. Topics include trends in R&D spending by federal agencies and industry, student enrollments and test scores, geographic distribution of academic R&D funds, professional employment by discipline, national comparisons of patents issued, survey findings on public attitudes toward science and technology, and much more. *Indicators* is produced by the National Science Foundation's Division of Science Resources Studies (SRS) for the National Science Board, NSF's equivalent of a board of trustees. The publication's appearance on schedule suggests that the long-troubled SRS Division is well along in its recovery from internal strife, muddled management, and rumors of fiscal misdeeds—the latter deemed baseless by NSF's Inspector General [SGR July 1, October 1]. Well edited and handsomely printed, *Indicators* is the standard source of data in Washington science-policy deliberations.

Order from: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies, Suite L-609, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/634-4300.

Financial Responsibility at Universities (Serial No. 102-23; 420 pp., no charge), texts of Congressman John Dingell's hearings, last March and May, that brought ignominy to Stanford University for its billing practices on indirect costs of federal support of research. Lots of exchanges on the celebrated yacht, flowers, social events, and other trifles that Stanford charged as overhead. The hearings led to the resignation of Stanford President Donald Kennedy, the current wave of refunds of overhead money by many major universities, and widespread reductions in indirect-cost rates that federal agencies set for academic institutions. The texts include testimony by Kennedy and Paul L. Biddle, the Navy financial auditor whose reports ignited the Dingell inquiry. Other universities are discussed, too, among them MIT, Harvard, Caltech, and Johns Hopkins. The Stanford performance in the Congressional hearing room—brash, evasive, and self-righteous—is a cameo case of misguided strategy in dealing with a Congressman armed with reams of embarrassing information.

Order from: US House of Representatives, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Documents Office, B-334 Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/225-0222.

Testing in American Schools: Asking the Right Questions (37 pp., no charge), from the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, summary edition of a forthcoming OTA report (due this month) that questions the validity and effects of standardized testing and urges more research and reliance on alternative testing methods, particularly "performance assessment." The report, prepared with the advice of a panel chaired by Sheldon H. White, Professor of Psychology, Harvard, observes: "When stakes are high, a heavy emphasis is sometimes placed on specific test results, and especially on increasing scores. The symptom—low test scores—is treated without affecting the underlying condition—low achievement."

Order from: US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, Washington, DC 20510-8025; tel. 202/224-8996.

Also from OTA: ***After the Cold War: Living With Lower Defense Spending*** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01274-0; 237 pp., $12), first in an OTA series on Technology and Defense Conversion, says projected reductions in defense-related employment might easily be absorbed in prosperous times, since they total only about 2.5 million jobs out of 119 million. But with the lingering recession, OTA warns, adjustments in some geographic regions and industries may be difficult. Among suggestions for taking up the slack in technical fields: Expansion of direct federal support for civilian R&D through various channels, including the Advanced Technology Program administered by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. OTA also observes: "Transportation in the United States is ripe for new technologies," adding that expansion of existing federal and California state programs in "intelligent vehicle and highway systems....might provide some exciting opportunities for defense companies, especially some of the highly sophisticated aerospace companies concentrated in Los Angeles, to adapt their military technologies to new, important commercial use." OTA estimates that 342,000 engineering jobs are in the defense sector—about 18 percent of all engineering employment—and that 127,000 of these might be eliminated between 1990-95. It's still too early in the layoff process to assess the reemployment picture, OTA states, while pointing out that federal assistance for retraining engineers and helping them into new jobs is pretty skimpy.

Order from: USGPO, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402-9325; tel. 202/783-3238.

The Prune Book: The 60 Toughest Science and Technology Jobs in Washington, by John H. Trattner (Madison Books, 545 pp., $37.50), from the Council for Excellence in Government, an alumni association of high-ranking federal officials (Honorary Co-Chairmen: Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford), profiles, based on interviews, of senior S&T positions in the federal establishment, including the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Defense, NSF, NIH, FDA, NASA, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and even the customarily silent CIA. Though brief and often short on details, the combat accounts from

(Continued on Page 7)